EXHIBIT D

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD ON APPEAL VOLUME 5(PAGES 858-1102)(END)

```
DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 1
             IN AND FOR THE FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
 2
 3
                            ---000---
 4
 5
    THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 6
 7
                 Plaintiff and Respondent,
                                             No.
 8
                VS.
                                             Alameda Co No.
 9
                                             141033
    IVAN KILGORE,
10
                 Defendant and Appellant.
11
12
13
            REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD ON APPEAL
14
15
        From Judgment of the Superior Court of the State
16
         of California, in and for the County of Alameda
17
            THE HONORABLE KENNETH R. KINGSBURY, JUDGE
                            ---000---
18
          MARCH 24, JUNE 27, JULY 11, JULY 14, JULY 21,
19
20
             AUGUST 15, DECEMBER 5, 2003, JANUARY 9,
              FEBRUARY 19, MARCH 10 & APRIL 9, 2004
21
22
23
    For the Respondent:
                              BILL LOCKYER
                              Attorney General of California
2.4
                              455 Golden Gate Ave, Suite 11000
                              San Francisco, CA 94102-3664
25
    For the Appellant:
                           IN PROPRIA PERSONA
26
27
28
    VOLUME 5 (Pages 858 - 1102) (end)
```

1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
2	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA				
3	BEFORE THE HONORABLE KENNETH R. KINGSBURY, JUDGE				
4	DEPARTMENT NO. 6				
5	00				
6					
7					
8	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
9	Plaintiff,				
10	vs. Nos. 141033				
11	IVAN KILGORE,				
12	Defendant.				
13	/				
14					
15					
16					
17					
18	COURTHOUSE, OAKLAND, ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA				
19	000				
20	TRANSCRIPT OF REPORTER'S RECORD ON APPEAL				
21	00				
22					
23	APPEARANCES				
24	For the Plaintiff: THOMAS J. ORLOFF District Attorney				
25	BY: DARRYL STALLWORTH, Deputy				
26	For the Defendant: DEBORAH LEVY, ESQ.				
27	WALTER K. PYLE, ESQ.				
28					

1	- DAYS OF PROCEEDINGS -	
2	000	
3		Page
4	MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2003	1
5	TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2003	11
6	THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2003	4 0
7	MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2003	4 3
8	THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2003	4 7
9	MONDAY, MARCH 10, 2003	78
10	TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 2003	221
11	THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2003	428
12	FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 2003	603
13	MONDAY, MARCH 17, 2003	637
14	TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 2003	712
15	WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 2003	739
16	MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2003	858
17	FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2003	871
18	FRIDAY, JULY 11, 2003	906
19	MONDAY, JULY 14, 2003	911
20	MONDAY, JULY 21, 2003	920
21	FRIDAY, AUGUST 15, 2003	923
22	FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2003	926
23	FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 2004	929
24	THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2004	960
25	WEDNESDAY, MARCH 10, 2004	1052
26	FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 2004	1088
27		
28		

1			
2			
3	- GENERAL INDEX -		
4	000		
5		Vol.	Page
6	MOTION TO BIFURCATE	1	20
7	DUE DILIGENCE HEARING	1	5 9
8	COURT'S PRE-INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY	1	8 6
9	OPENING STATEMENT BY MR. STALLWORTH	1	98
10	STIPULATION	1	159
11	402 HEARING	2	221
12	STIPULATION	2	223
13	STIPULATION	3	593
14	DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO EXCLUDE PRIORS	3	607
15	STIPULATION	4	653
16	PEOPLE REST	4	657
17	OPENING STATEMENT BY MS. LEVY	4	658
18	DEFENDANT RESTS	4	703
19	COURT'S INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY	4	748
20	OPENING ARGUMENT BY MR. STALLWORTH	4	782
21	CLOSING ARGUMENT BY MS. LEVY	4	802
22	FINAL ARGUMENT BY MR. STALLWORTH	4	829
23	COURT'S CONCLUDING INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY	4	8 4 8
24	TO THE JUNE		
25	VERDICT OF THE JURY	5	861
26	DEFENDANT'S MOTION FORE NEW TRIAL (In-Camera under separate cover)	5	871
27	(In-Camera under Separate Cover)		
28	APPOINTMENT OF WALTER K. PYLE, ESQ.	5	920

Case 3:07-cv-05124-SI Document 13-12 Filed 09/05/2008 Page 6 of 52

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL (CONT'D)	5	929
ARGUMENTS AND RULING ON MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL	5	1052
PROCEEDINGS ON SENTENCE	5	1088
·		
	(CONT'D) ARGUMENTS AND RULING ON MOTION FOR	(CONT'D) ARGUMENTS AND RULING ON MOTION FOR 5 NEW TRIAL

1	- INDEX OF WITNESSES -				
2	(Alphabetical)				
3	00				
4	FOR THE PEOPLE:	VOL.	PAGE		
5	ANDERSON, SHANAE	1	168		
6	BRYANT, MATTHEW	2	3 4 2		
7	CARLSON, PETER	1	60		
8	FESTAG, SEAN	1	114		
9	GREEN, PHIL	3	503,570		
10	HERRMANN, M.D., PAUL	1	152		
11	JONES, RAYMOND	2	224,258		
12	MILLER, ALLAN	3	560		
13	MOORE, BIANCA	3	428		
14	VIGILIENZONE, THOMAS	1	136		
15					
16					
17	FOR THE DEFENSE:				
18	BEERS, MONTE (Trial & Motion)	4,5	696,973		
19	GREEN, PHIL (Motion)	5	960		
20	KILGORE, IVAN (Motion)	5	1043		
21	LEVY, DEBORAH (Motion)	5	937 , 975		
22	LOGGINS, MARY	4	659		
23	MILLER, TAYLOR	4	692		
24	OLIVAS, ENOCH JOSEPH (Motion)	5	966		
25	TOMLINSONN, KEVIN	2	401		
26	WASHINGTON, MARY	4	676		
27					
28					

1						
2						
3						
4	- INDEX OF	WITNES	SES -			
5	(CHRONO	LOGICA	L)			
6	0	00				
7	FOR THE PEOPLE:	DIR.	CRS.	RED.	REC.	VD.
8	PETER CARLSON	60	6 4	68	69	
9	(Due Diligence)					
10	SEAN FESTAG	114	125			
11	THOMAS VIGILIENZONE	136	145	150		
12	PAUL HERRMANN, M.D.	152	163	167		
13	SHANAE ANDERSON	168	190	210	214	
14	RAYMOND JONES	224	229			
15	(402 Hearing)					
16	RAYMOND JONES	258	287			
17				340	341	
18	MATTHEW BRYANT	342	392	396	399	
19	BIANCA MOORE	428	457	494 501		
20				301	502	
21	PHIL GREEN	503				
22	ALLAN MILLER	560	564	568	569	
23.	PHIL GREEN (Cont'd)		570	645	650	
24				654	655	
25						
26						
27						
28						

1					
2					
3					
4	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	DIR.	CRS.	RED.	REC. VD.
5	KEVIN TOMLINSONN	401 411	417		405
6		111	417		
7	MARY LOGGINS	659	665	670	
8	MARY WASHINGTON	676	681	690	691
9	TAYLOR MILLER	692	695		
10	MONTE BEERS	696	700	702	
11	DEBORAH LEVY	937			
12	PHIL GREEN	960			
13	ENOCH JOSEPH OLIVAS	966			
14	MONTE BEERS (Recalled)	973			
15	DEBORAH LEVY (Continued)	975	1021	1029	
16	IVAN KILGORE	1043			
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
2 4					
25					
26					
27					
28					

	-		
1			
2	- INDEX OF EXHIBIT	rs -	
3	000		
4	FOR THE PEOPLE:	IDEN.	EVID.
5	10	229	252
6	11 & 11A	369	
7	8 C	532	
8	1		604
9	2 through 8		605
10	8B		605
11	10 through 12		606
12	13		607
13	14	636	
14			
15	FOR THE DEFENSE:		
16	A through D		607
17	A (Motion)	961	
18	B (Motion)	990	
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2003

---000---

- PROCEEDINGS -

---000---

(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in open court without the presence of the jury)

THE COURT: In the matter of People versus

Kilgore. The jury is not here. Ms. Levy is here, and

Mr. Stallworth was here but had to go.

We have received another note from the jury indicating that they wanted all of the testimony of Shanae Anderson and portions of Sergeant Green's testimony that refer to his interview with Shanae on July 16 and 17.

Mr. Dohrmann has indicated that he has the testimony of Shanae Anderson ready to go. He is working on Sergeant Green's.

It is my understanding, Ms. Levy, that you have spoken with Mr. Stallworth, and both of you indicate that in terms of at least Shanae Anderson's testimony, it's okay if he goes up and reads it to them upstairs.

MS. LEVY: That's correct. And, Judge, even in terms of Sergeant Green's, Darryl's directions to me, or whatever, Jerry and I agree to it, and it should be fine.

THE COURT: So, my suggestion is go ahead and read Shanae's testimony to them, and tell them you are working on Sergeant Green's. And when you have those

```
portions, give us an idea so we can let Ms. Levy Mr.
 1
    Stallworth know. And when we have those portions ready
2
    to go, we will do it.
 3
           (Whereupon, the mid-morning recess was taken)
 4
                             ---000---
 5
 6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

1 AFTERNOON PROCEEDINGS -2 ---000---(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in 3 4 open court without the presence of the jury) 5 THE COURT: The record should reflect in the Kilgore matter that counsel are both present. 6 7 Mr. Dohrmann has prepared the second part of the testimony that's asked for by the jury, and that was the 8 9 selected portion of Sergeant Green's testimony that 10 dealt with cross-examination of Shanae Anderson. Copies have been provided. 11 12 It is my understanding that it's okay for him to 13 read it without us being present? 14 MS. LEVY: Yes, Your Honor. MR. STALLWORTH: Yes, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Thanks. Anybody have anything 16 they want to say for the record at all? 17 MR. STALLWORTH: No, Your Honor. 18 MS. LEVY: No, Your Honor. 19 (Record re-read by the Reporter) 20 (Whereupon, the mid-afternoon recess was taken) 21 ---000---22 23 24 25 26 27 28

```
1
                         - AFTER RECESS -
 2
                            ---000---
 3
            (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in
 4
    open court without the presence of the jury)
 5
              THE COURT: In the Kilgore matter, both
 6
    counsel are present, as is Mr. Kilgore.
 7
           Mr. Juarez, you indicated that the jury stated
 8
    they have reached a verdict?
 9
              THE BAILIFF: Yes.
10
              THE COURT: All right. Both sides ready for
11
    the jury?
12
              MR. STALLWORTH: Yes, Your Honor.
13
              MS. LEVY: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Before I call for the jury, ladies
14
15
    and gentlemen, I know this is an emotional time for
16
    everybody. I would ask you to keep your emotions in
17
    check.
18
           Bring the jury down.
19
                            ---000---
20
           (Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in
21
    open court with the presence of the jury)
22
                       VERDICT OF THE JURY
23
              THE COURT: Good afternoon, ladies and
24
    gentlemen. The record should reflect that the twelve
25
    seated jurors are here.
26
           And I understand, juror No. 6, you were selected
27
    as the foreperson?
28
              JUROR NO. 6: Yes, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: Deputy Juarez told me you reached 1 2 a verdict? JUROR NO. 6: That's correct. 3 THE COURT: Could you please give the forms to 4 5 Deputy Juarez? 6 In just a minute, I'm going to hand these forms 7 to Ms. Boyns for the reading of the verdict. Please 8 listen carefully to make sure that the verdict as read 9 is your true and individual verdict. 10 Once the verdicts are read, I will ask either 11 attorney if they would like the jury polled. And what that means is Mrs. Boyns will ask you a question and she 12 13 will start with juror No. 1: Is the verdict as read your true and correct verdict? Yes or no. No. 2? 14 15 3? Et cetera. (Examining) 16 Ms. Boyns. THE CLERK: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen of the 17 18 jury, will you please listen to the reading of the 19 verdict. Omitting the title of the court and the cause. 20 Verdict of jury: We, the jury in the above-21 entitled cause, find the defendant, Ivan Kilgore, guilty 22 of a felony, to wit: Murder in the first degree, a 2.3 violation of section 187 of the Penal Code as charged in 2.4 the Information. 25 Special circumstance: We, the jury, further find true the alleged special circumstance that the murder in 26 27 the first degree was intentional and perpetrated by means of discharging a firearm from a motor vehicle 28

```
1
    intentionally at another person or persons outside the
 2
    vehicle, with the intent to inflict death.
           We, the jury, further find that in and during the
 3
    commission and attempted commission of the above
 4
 5
    offense, the said Ivan Kilgore did personally and
 6
    intentionally discharge a firearm and proximately cause
    death to William Anderson, 12022.53(d) PC.
 7
 8
           March 24th, 2003. Foreperson, No. 6.
 9
              THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, was the
    verdict just read by Ms. Boyns your true and correct
10
11
    verdict?
12
           (Jury agrees)
13
              THE COURT: Would either side like the jury
14
    polled?
              MR. STALLWORTH: I do not, Your Honor.
15
16
              MS. LEVY: Your Honor, the defense would
17
    request that. Thank you.
18
              THE COURT: Thank you.
              THE CLERK: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury,
19
20
    I'm going to ask you each individually if the verdict as
21
    just read was your true and individual verdict.
22
           Juror No. 1, was the verdict as just read your
23
    true and individual verdict?
              JUROR NO. 1: Yes.
2.4
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 2, was the verdict as
25
    just read your true and individual verdict?
26
27
              JUROR NO. 2: Yes.
28
```

```
1
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 3, was the verdict as
 2
    just read your true and individual verdict?
 3
              JUROR NO. 3: Yes.
 4
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 4, was the verdict as
 5
    just read your true and individual verdict?
 6
              JUROR NO. 4: Yes.
 7
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 5, was the verdict as
 8
    just read your true and individual verdict?
 9
              JUROR NO. 5: Yes.
10
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 6, was the verdict as
11
    just read your true and individual verdict?
12
              JUROR NO. 6: Yes.
13
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 7, was the verdict as
    just read your true and individual verdict?
14
15
              JUROR NO. 7: Yes.
16
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 8, was the verdict as
17
    just read your true and individual verdict?
18
              JUROR NO. 8: Yes.
19
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 9, was the verdict as
20
    just read your true and individual verdict?
21
              JUROR NO. 9: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 10, was the verdict as
22
    just read your true and individual verdict?
23
2.4
              JUROR NO. 10: Yes.
25
              THE CLERK: Juror No. 11, was the verdict as
26
    just read your true and individual verdict?
27
              JUROR NO. 11: Yes.
              THE CLERK: And juror No. 12, was the verdict
28
```

```
as just read your true and individual verdict?
 1
 2
              JUROR NO. 12: Yes.
              THE CLERK: Okay. Your Honor, the verdict has
 3
    been affirmed as read by all twelve jurors.
 4
              THE COURT: Any legal cause why the verdict
 5
    should not be recorded?
 6
 7
              MR. STALLWORTH: No, Your Honor.
 8
              MS. LEVY: No, Your Honor.
 9
              THE COURT: Record the verdict, please.
10
              THE CLERK: The verdict is recorded.
11
              THE COURT: Thank you.
12
           With the recording of the verdict, you will not
13
    have to hear me say "do not discuss this case with
    anyone" again, or "do any independent investigation."
14
15
    At this point all those restrictions are eliminated.
16
           I'm directing Mr. Dohrmann right now to have all
17
    personal information, such as names, any kind of
18
    address -- I don't think there are any phone numbers in
19
    the personal information here -- kept confidential from
20
    the record.
21
           Just as it is your right to speak to anyone you
22
    wish to speak to at this point, it is equally and
23
    perhaps more important you have a right not to talk to
24
    anybody that you don't want to talk to about this case.
25
           If someone wants to talk to you, that is
26
    completely your decision. But if you tell them you
2.7
    don't want to talk to them, and they persist, please let
28
    the Court know either through the bailiff or telephoning
```

1.3

2.1

this phone number that's listed on the board there, and we will handle it. I have only had that happen, I think, twice in my career. It normally doesn't, but I wanted you to know that.

This case was a relatively short case, although obviously the issues involved here were very serious. This is the kind of situation that, sitting as a judge and having been in this business for a lot of years, I prefer not to decide this kind of issue myself, because I'm not representative of the whole community, which all of you are. You bring to us that layman's expertise from the community.

I know it's been an imposition on each one of you and your time, on all of your time. The schedule has been a bit off again on again, but I want to commend you all. This jury was, once we got started, I think, on time every time, every day, and it certainly made it much easier for the Court to have that happen.

Sometimes the attorneys will want to talk to you after a trial just to get your own personal take on how the trial went, on what you thought the evidence showed, on what you thought the evidence didn't show. They don't do that out of any sense of morbid curiosity, but both Mr. Stallworth and Ms. Levy are professional attorneys, and they are not looking for a report card on their performance, I don't think, but it is helpful perhaps in future cases that both may try if there are things that you observed that you thought made the trial

clearer to you or perhaps was left somewhat muddied.

They would like to know that, because they will be back in other courtrooms trying cases again.

I know that the \$15 a day that jurors make, and although our luncheon budget has increased somewhat, there is not a great amount of reward there, either, certainly not for the services you provide for the court.

On behalf of the court, on behalf of me personally, you certainly made my life very easy during the course of this trial, and I personally thank you.

Your jury duty, as it were, your civic obligation for the year, is now taken up. If you get called again within a year, please remember this period of time, mid-March, so you can send it back, if you do not wish to serve on another jury for the next year, letting them know, "I served in Department 6 and roughly during March of 2000."

With that, you are excused. And, normally, if the attorneys want to speak with you, they will come up to the 6th floor. If you don't want to speak with them, pack your stuff up and feel free to leave.

If you don't mind talking to them for a few minutes, you can wait on the 6th floor. They will be here with me for a couple of minutes and after that, I will release them. Probably less than five minutes.

So, you are excused. Thank you.

---000---

```
(Whereupon, the following proceedings were had in
 1
    open court without the presence of the jury)
 2
              THE COURT: I don't know as of this point
 3
    whether or not Mr. Kilgore has a bail. It appears he
 4
 5
    does not.
 6
           In any event, his bail will remain at no bail at
 7
    this point.
 8
           I'm going to refer Mr. Kilgore's matter to the
 9
    probation officer for a report pursuant to 1203 of the
1.0
    Penal Code. The only question is would you like it on a
11
    time-waiver or no-time-waiver basis?
12
           And, Mr. Kilgore, what that means is, I'm going
    to have a probation officer interview you to write a
13
14
    report for the court and for me to consider at the time
15
    of sentencing. You have a right to have that report
16
    within 20 judicial days, which usually works out to
17
    about a month.
           If you wish to waive time for sentencing, I can
18
    set it at some point beyond that, depending on how long
19
20
    it's going to take your attorney to do whatever she has
21
    to do.
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I would like to waive
2.3
    time.
              THE COURT: It will be so noted. Do you have
24
25
    a date in mind, Ms. Levy?
              MS. LEVY: No, Your Honor. If I may have a
26
27
    moment.
28
              THE COURT: Sure.
```

```
1
              MS. LEVY: (Examining)
              THE COURT: I'm going to be gone the early
 2
 3
    part of May.
                         I'm sorry, Your Honor?
 4
              MS. LEVY:
              THE COURT: I will be gone the early a part of
 5
 6
    May.
              MS. LEVY: Your Honor, would the Court be
 7
    willing to put this over to the early part of June?
 8
 9
    know Mr. Kilgore is willing to waive time.
              THE COURT: Any objection?
10
11
              MR. STALLWORTH: No objection, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Pick a day.
12
              MS. LEVY: Is the Court available on Friday?
13
14
    Or, if not --
15
              THE COURT: That's my Law & Motion day
    normally. Let me just look here.
16
17
              THE CLERK: June 6th is Law & Motion.
              THE COURT: It would be on June 13th.
18
              MS. LEVY: That would be fine, Your Honor.
19
20
              THE COURT: All right. We have the issue
    remaining as to what to do about that prior conviction.
21
              MR. STALLWORTH: At this point, given the
22
    jury's verdict --
23
24
              THE COURT: You want to hold that until the
25
    same day?
              MR. STALLWORTH:
26
                               Yes.
27
              THE COURT: So, the issue on the prior will
    also be continued until the 13th. And hopefully by
28
```

```
1
    then, if you intend to proceed on that prior, Mr.
 2
    Stallworth, you will have whatever documents you need
    and be prepared to proceed -- documents and/or
 3
 4
    witnesses, obviously.
 5
              MR. STALLWORTH: That's correct, with notice
 6
    to both the Court and counsel way ahead of time.
 7
              THE COURT: All right. You can do that as
 8
    late as the 13th, Ms. Levy?
 9
              MS. LEVY: Yes, Your Honor. That would be
10
    fine.
11
              THE COURT: Anything further that either of
12
    you would care to say for the record today?
13
              MR. STALLWORTH: No, Your Honor.
14
              MS. LEVY: No, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: See you on the 13th at 9:00
16
    o'clock for report and sentence.
17
            (Whereupon, the evening recess was taken)
18
                            ---000---
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 2003

---000---

- PROCEEDINGS -

---000---

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL

THE COURT: All right. In the matter of People versus Kilgore, No. 141033.

The record should reflect that Mr. Stallworth is here representing the People; Ms. Levy is here representing Mr. Kilgore; and Mr. Kilgore is present in custody.

Just for the record, so it's completely clear, before counsel arrived this morning, when I got here this morning, Mr. Kilgore was here and neither counsel was here. I had some brief unreported discussions with Mr. Kilgore about the nature of what he was seeking.

The reason I did that is because, after reading the transcript of the proceedings on June the 13th and the motion that was filed by Ms. Levy, I got some indication that maybe I had misconstrued what Mr. Kilgore was seeking to do, and I wanted to clarify that, and I believe we did, but perhaps not. We will discuss that in a moment.

In addition to that, just so the record is completely clear, that at Mr. Kilgore's request, I did show him one appellate decision that he cited for me, People vs. Dennis, in 177 Cal.App.3d; I also showed him portions of People vs. Stewart, at 171 Cal.App.3d;

2.0

Evidence Code 958, which deals with a possible waiver of attorney-client privilege, where in a criminal case could be brought to bear if there was a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel.

That was the sum and substance of it.

There was also some discussion about whether the proceeding this morning would be, quote, unquote, incamera. My response was, "Depends."

There was also a question by Mr. Kilgore as to whether or not things he said during a motion for new trial alleging ineffective assistance of counsel, if they did come to the fore at a formal hearing in that regard, after a formal motion was made, would he have any kind of immunity as to that, and I told Mr. Kilgore I don't give advice.

I would be glad to share my books with you, but I don't give legal advice. Mr. Kilgore that's basically what I remember saying. Is there anything that you want to add to that?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: All right. Basically I had calendared this after our initial discussions last time for a Marsden motion. But in looking at counsel's motion again, which I did not have a great opportunity to do the last hearing, and reading the transcript of what pretty obvious to me Mr. Kilgore was trying to communicate to the Court, I had some second thoughts about what he was seeking to do, and I was looking at it

2.4

more like he was intending to have a post-trial presentence Marsden motion.

In reading the motion again, and in reading what Mr. Kilgore was trying to say to the Court, or what I believe he was trying to say to the Court, that may not be the case.

The other alternative -- or the inference that I drew from the readings that I have done is that at this point he was not seeking to make a Marsden motion. What he was seeking to do was to have in part a new trial motion based on ineffective assistance of counsel during the trial. He wasn't seeking to have Ms. Levy discharged at this point, but was seeking to have a new trial granted based on ineffective assistance of counsel, and in that regard, was asking the Court to appoint a separate attorney, or to have a separate attorney appointed to represent him for the purposes of that motion, given that it would be very difficult for Ms. Levy to argue that motion, since she was the trial lawyer.

You tell me, where are we going?

THE DEFENDANT: No. Basically the other thing about the appointment of the attorney was the fact that I'm not skilled in matters of law.

THE COURT: You have to keep your voice up.
THE DEFENDANT: Some issues I would like to

address concerning Ms. Levy's incompetence have to do with matters involving that was another reason for my

request for a newly appointed attorney. 1 2 THE COURT: As to this matters, is it a 3 Marsden motion or is it a new trial motion on ineffective assistance of counsel? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: I mean at this point the things 6 7 that have happened have happened. The trial is in the 8 books. And other than your motions now, the only thing 9 that remains is sentencing, other than your motions and 10 the resolution of those motions. It's either going to 1 1 be --12 THE DEFENDANT: It's a motion for a new trial 13 basically grants relief for incompetence of attorney. 14 THE COURT: And are you asking the Court to 15 seek for you another court-appointed attorney for a 16 motion for new trial? It's my understanding, in reading the Stewart 17 18 case, which is cited in Ms. Levy's moving papers, it's 19 at 171 Cal.App.3d, the burden on you would be to show to the Court -- I think the language used is a "colorable 20 21 claim to ineffective assistance of counsel." Fairly low 22 burden, but nonetheless a burden. 23 If the Court finds a colorable claim, it is my 24 understanding of the law that a separate court-appointed 25 attorney would be appointed to you to represent you for 26 the purposes of that motion, and perhaps other purposes, 27 but initially for the purposes of that motion.

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

```
1
              THE COURT: Is that what you are asking the
 2
    Court to do?
 3
              THE DEFENDANT: Correct.
 4
              THE COURT: In terms of your colorable claim,
 5
    People vs. Stewart, and I believe other cases, have
 6
    indicated that in some circumstances those claims should
 7
    be made in open court and in some circumstances those
 8
    claims should be made in-camera.
 9
           And I don't know how many claims you have, but it
10
    seems to me that unless all of them need to be held
11
    in-camera for whatever reason you are going to tell me
12
    about, that perhaps, if there are multiple reasons --
13
    if, and I don't know whether there are or not, because
14
    we haven't talked about it -- if there are multiple
15
    reasons, some of which can be discussed in public and
16
    some of which can't, is that the situation?
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Is it possible you --
19
    and I know you have a spread of papers there -- to
20
    separate those that can be discussed in Mr. Stallworth's
21
    presence? Because if it gets to a motion for a new
22
    trial, the other side is going to be represented. I
23
    mean that's not going to be --
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I have some 40
25
    different issues that I would like to address concerning
26
    my attorney's incompetence.
27
              THE COURT: Well --
28
              THE DEFENDANT: Of those 40 issues, as we
```

```
discussed, some of them I feel that I can address before
 1
    Mr. Stallworth.
 2
 3
              THE COURT: I understand.
              THE DEFENDANT: Some I can't. In looking
 4
 5
    through this, it would take some time for me to go
 6
    through and decipher which ones I can and can't.
 7
              THE COURT: Do you have them laid out there?
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have all of the note
 8
 9
    form and typed -- some of them typed and so forth.
10
              THE COURT: Those are your documents.
11
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
              THE COURT: You are familiar with them?
12
13
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
14
              THE COURT: Let's start with the first one and
15
    go all the way through. And if you find one of those in
16
    looking at it, when you are about to address it, that
    it's going to say something that for some reason, for
17
18
    instance, might tend to incriminate you at some future
19
    trial -- and I don't know about the immunity issue, I'm
20
    not advising you in that regard -- if there's some issue
21
    about that, set it aside, and then we will discuss
22
    whether it's going to be in-camera or not after we go
23
    through the ones that aren't.
24
           Mr. Stallworth, you seem like a man in need of a
25
    tablet.
26
              THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, counsel just
27
    advised me that it is best for me to address all of my
```

issues in-camera. She doesn't feel there would be any

necessary need for Mr. Stallworth to be present.

THE COURT: Well, that's nice for her to say. And you have read the <u>Stewart</u> case, as I have, too. It talks about in-camera if needed.

And some of those issues, if they concern things that are part of the public record already that happened at trial, what's the point of asking Mr. Stallworth to leave? Eventually, when a new motion is made for a new trial, he is going to be there, because it's going to be a written motion, and this is just to decide whether or not there is a colorable claim.

So, I'm going to ask you -- and, you know, if it looks like it's going to be disclosing some information -- and you are aware of the Stewart case; that in that case, if it's the same one I remember, it had something to do with a guy trying to escape, and there were a couple of issues raised in that case. One is that the gentleman was not -- didn't have all of his mental faculties and was subject to seizures. I think he said he fell off the roof ladder, and the Court held that that was something that came out at the trial.

But the other side of it was, there was a failure to call some specific witnesses. And that may be something that would be -- something that came out of the trial.

You know, do the best you can. Err on the side of caution if it's something that you think should be in-camera; but if it's something that came out at

```
trial -- and I am probably going to ask Mr. Dohrmann to
 1
 2
    prepare the transcript of this proceeding -- so try to
 3
    be -- don't ramble. I know I tend to. I'm doing it
    right now. But try to be as concise as you can as I'm
 4
 5
    going to attempt to take notes.
           And if you would, just say "first" or "one", or
 6
 7
    something like that, so, you know, I want to be able to
    do it in an orderly fashion, so that somebody looking at
 8
 9
    this in the future, if it's necessary, can make sense
    out of it.
10
11
           And the reason I'm prefacing my remarks among
12
    those things that I read was your exhibit No. 1 to the
13
    Marsden motion had with Judge Nakahara back in February,
    and some of that was a bit rambling. So, be as clear as
14
15
    you can.
16
              THE DEFENDANT: Can I have some time to look
17
    through this? (Examining)
18
              THE COURT: And, Mr. Stallworth, I'm sitting
19
    here talking about your position. I don't even know if
20
    you want to be here for this.
              MR. STALLWORTH: I do.
21
              THE DEFENDANT: One issue I would like to
22
23
    address to start off is the misstatement counsel made in
24
    the language that was used to dismiss the Oklahoma prior
25
    as a strike for purpose of impeachment.
26
              THE COURT: Okay. Let me make a note.
27
    believe that was discussed on the record; right?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. The defendant's

```
anticipated trial testimony was incorrectly stated --
 1
    well, if I could.
 2
           (Short discussion off the record)
 3
 4
              THE COURT: This is your motion; but, on the
 5
    other hand, Ms. Levy is an attorney.
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: If I could, most of things I
 7
    have written down to read in court, that way I get all
 8
    of the facts and details in, because I don't want to sit
 9
    up here and refreshing them out of my memory and
10
    misstate them. So, I would like to read what I have
11
    written on my motions to be entered into the Court
12
    record.
13
              THE COURT: That's fine, but read them. Read
14
    them knowing I'm going to be listening and writing them
15
    down; okay?
16
              THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Again, I proffered
17
    defendant's anticipated trial testimony was incorrectly
18
    stated within the content of the motion, in light of
19
    that fact counsel has since being appointed to the
20
    defendant's case, had in her possession a copy of the
    defendant's anticipated testimony.
21
22
              THE COURT: Now, that's the issue, as I
23
    recall, that was brought up during the trial about the
24
    wording of a motion.
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
26
              THE COURT: And that motion was a written
27
    motion that was filed --
28
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: -- true?
 2
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes. At the initial filing of
 3
    that motion, and when counsel gave it to me to review, I
 4
    read over it, and I pointed out to her she was incorrect
 5
    in the language. Counsel stated to me at that time that
    it was irrelevant.
 6
              THE COURT: And this is on the record. We had
 7
 8
    this discussion on the record and it concerned whether
 9
    or not I was going to allow you to be impeached, if you
10
    testify, with the situation in Oklahoma.
11
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             Right.
12
              THE COURT:
                         And your point was --
13
              THE DEFENDANT: First of all, she hadn't --
14
    she had a copy of my anticipated testimony from the
15
    beginning of her appointment. So, I don't understand
16
    how she could have made that mistake.
17
              THE COURT: Now, that point was brought to the
18
    Court's attention before the ruling was made; true?
19
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             True. It was. I'm moving on
20
    because it's going --
21
              THE COURT:
                          I got it.
22
              THE DEFENDANT: -- to go into something else.
23
              THE COURT: That's No. 1.
24
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes. That's No. 1.
25
           As I stated, her response to the misstated
26
    language was that it was irrelevant. Well, the
27
    irrelevant language, the language became a factor in the
28
    Judge's ruling to allow the Prosecutor to use the
```

```
testimony of the prior to impeach the defendant's
 1
    defense of unreasonable self-defense as the attorney had
 2
 3
    mistakingly worded the proffer (sic).
 4
              THE COURT: Let me say one thing, that you are
    anticipating and trying to think what my rulings were
 5
 6
    based on. My recollection is that that situation was
7
    cleared up by you and Ms. Levy before I made my
    decision, and I understood your motion and still made my
 8
    decision in the corrected form. And if that was wrong
 9
    on my part, it was; but I decided on what I had before
10
11
    me, which included both your and Ms. Levy's correction
12
    of what the true situation is alleged to have been;
13
    okav?
14
              THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
              THE COURT: So, I just want to throw that in
15
16
    as my piece.
17
              THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
18
           Well, at the time that counsel acknowledged to
19
    the Court the mistake, she pointed out to the defendant
20
    that because of this mistaken language and her
    admonishing the Court of the issue, that the Judge
21
22
    was -- probably most likely upset due to the fact that
23
    she was changing the defense from unreasonable self-
24
    defense to reasonable self-defense due to the nature of
```

At the time you made your ruling, I asked counsel to file a writ of mandate to address the issue to the appeals court at that moment. Counsel refused because

2.5

26

27

28

the language.

```
1
    she didn't know how to file a writ of mandate.
                                                     She was
 2
    uncomfortable.
 3
           And I like to also address counsel, failed to
 4
    research the application of the law provided under
 5
    Evidence Section Code (Sic) 1101(c).
              THE COURT: Is this the same point?
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, the same point. Of
 7
 8
    1101(c) in a matter of a diligent and conscious effort.
 9
           Counsel may respond to my comments and saying she
10
    wasn't conscious of the fact that the prosecution would
11
    seek to introduce the prior on the testimony of this
    subdivision, being that it was subdivision (c) was only
12
13
    made mention during the hearing.
           In addressing the 1101(b), I feel that counsel
14
15
    failed to argue --
              THE COURT: Is this a different point now, or
16
17
    same point?
18
              THE DEFENDANT: It's all in the same essence
19
    of the issue.
20
              THE COURT: All right.
              THE DEFENDANT: I feel counsel failed to argue
21
22
    that section 1101 prohibits admission of other crime
23
    evidence for the purpose of showing the defendant's bad
24
    character.
              THE COURT: Mr. Kilgore, let me cut you off
25
26
    there. And the reason I'm doing it is, there was no
27
    1101(b) evidence here. The issue was whether or not you
28
    could be impeached if you chose to testify. This was
```

```
1
    not a case where the Prosecutor made a motion under
 2
    1101(b) that was permitted. I didn't even know if he
 3
    made one at this point, but that's a different bucket of
 4
    worms.
 5
           If a person makes a motion under 1101(b), the
    conduct itself then is allowed to be introduced to
 6
    basically show intent, motive, those kinds of things
 7
 8
    under 1101(b). And I don't think there was a 1101(b)
 9
    motion here, was there?
10
              MR. STALLWORTH: No, there wasn't.
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Well, there was a discussion
12
    of the Evidence Code of 1101(b) due to the fact that the
13
    motion that the District Attorney had failed to impeach
    the defendants.
14
15
              THE COURT: Different.
16
              THE DEFENDANT: Two different things.
17
           The other issue I'm addressing, counsel's
18
    arguments and her representation on behalf of that issue
19
    where I felt she fell short to deny it, first of all,
20
    researching the issue of 1101(c). She did 1101(b) but
21
    not (c).
22
              THE COURT: All right. And as I was --
23
              THE DEFENDANT: And as I was saying, the
    section prohibits admission, the arguments fell short
24
25
    that the section prohibits the admission of other crime
26
    evidence for the purpose of showing defendant's bad
27
    character or criminal propensity.
```

THE COURT: I'm aware of the provisions of

long time, and I'm going to ask you, do you have access

27

28

to a typewriter?

THE DEFENDANT: No. 1 THE COURT: I'm going to ask, you know, I want 2 you to give me the summary idea at this point. 3 As you know, the only burden you have here is to 4 5 raise a colorable claim. This is not your actual motion for a new trial; okay? Sort of the preliminaries of 6 7 one. THE DEFENDANT: Well, just a couple more 8 9 comments. THE COURT: All right. Just read them, 1.0 11 please, then. 12 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Furthermore, counsel 1.3 filed to argue the existence of the policy requiring 14 exclusion of the evidence that forbid the prosecution 15 from using a prior in any form to question the defendant's credibility, because of judicial elements of 16 17 the crime are not -- do not involve moral turpitude, making an unimpeachable crime; therefore, forbid 18 19 1101(c). 20 I would like to point out, too, that when my attorney asked the prosecution what fact he chose to 21 22 prove with the prior testimony, he mentioned something about 27 factors being in my prior testimony that were 23

similar to the present case.

24

25

26

27

28

My counsel at that time asked, you know, to present to the Court those issues, some 20, I believe he say, and he didn't present any to support his argument for using the prior, which my counsel didn't make any

886 mention of that or refer in her argument. 1 2 I have to make mention because of that, counsel 3 advised that ruling that the Judge made, counsel advised the defendant not to testify. She also made a record of 4 that. 5 Well, counsel also failed to make a record that, 6 because of that ruling, she changed my defense in the 7 8 midst of all of the preparation she had previously made to one of reasonable doubt, which she didn't take 9 10 anytime to prepare, for before that ruling and for that moment in the trial, proceeded to argue a reasonable 11 12 doubt defense. She also failed to call witnesses. 13 THE COURT: Now, are we into a different point 14 now. 15 THE DEFENDANT: No. Let me stop right there 16

before I continue on with that point.

And in light of the issue of counsel refusing to file the writ, I would like to state that it's counsel's duty to preserve actions of defendants, counsel due to take all actions to preserve a defendant's right to fair trial.

THE COURT: In theory I'm supposed to know what the law is; okay? I want to just know what your complaints are.

THE DEFENDANT: Moving onto another issue --

THE COURT: Okay.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

THE DEFENDANT: -- I would like to address counsel's comments in the closing arguments concerning

1 someone firing shots at the car and someone returning 2 fire is self-defense where it's totally unsupported in 3 the evidence that was presented in trial. 4 Counsel also submitted that during that argument 5 this defendant was sitting in the position where the 6 shooter was located in the car, thus making an implication that the defendant fired the shot, which contra-7 8 dicted her argument of reasonable doubt. 9 Furthermore, counsel's request of the self-10 defense instruction was unsupported, I believe, in the 11 evidence, and its purpose was prejudicial to effect the 12 reasonable doubt argument. Also, counsel attempted to persuade the 13 14 defendant's inquiry as for the instruction and its 15 prejudicial effect. Counsel sought to introduce this 16 instruction as a tactical strategy to give, quote, the jury any possible means to reach a verdict of not 17 18 guilty. Hearing the defendant questions counsel's 19 20 failure -- and this is going to another issue -- call 21 witnesses to support that tactic. Those witnesses 22 were --23 THE COURT: I'm going to need the names, too. THE DEFENDANT: Those witnesses were Betsy 24 25 Varela. 26 THE COURT: Spell that. 27 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. B-e-t-s-y, V-a-r-e-l-a; 28 and Halvechia, H-a-l-v-e-c-h-i-a, Osborne,

```
1
    O-s-b-o-r-n-e; and Jamario Hennen, J-a-m-a-r-i-o,
 2
    Hennen, H-e-n-n-e-n.
 3
           These witnesses' testimony was relevant to the
    argument in front of the instructions to support it,
 4
    such as an instruction which may be -- going into
 5
 6
    another issue -- pertaining to prior assaults by the
 7
    deceased and his gang and prior acts of violence.
 8
           I have here, Your Honor, an affidavit, also a
 9
    transcribed copy of Jemarrio Hennen's taped statement to
    homicide officer Lou Cruz, and, again, the affidavits of
10
11
    Betsy Varela and Halvechia Osborne, stating the
12
    content -- summary of their testimony.
13
              MS. LEVY: Your Honor, I would ask to review
14
    those if I'm going to have an opportunity to respond.
                                                            Ι
15
    have not seen them.
16
              THE COURT: All right. So, that's -- so,
17
    failure to call witnesses, you have given me three
18
    names. You have talked about some documents.
19
    Apparently, Ms. Levy is looking at them now in terms of
20
    what we ought to do with them.
21
           That's that point: Failure to call witnesses?
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: Got it. We put what's going to
24
    happen with the affidavits on hold. As a part of the
25
    other, the statement that was made to Lou Cruz, I'm
26
    assuming that all parties have that already.
27
              MS. LEVY: Correct, Your Honor.
28
              THE COURT: Okay.
```

```
1
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              I would like to say, in
 2
    addition to the statement of Jemarrio Hennen, his
 3
    statements would have undermined some of the prose-
 4
    cution's argument which he made to the Court, which
    counsel failed to present, and Jemarrio Hennen is the
 5
 6
    cousin of the deceased.
 7
              THE COURT: Okay.
              THE DEFENDANT: Moving on to another issue, I
 8
 9
    would like to address counsel's failure to investigate
    any of the prosecution witnesses before trial.
10
11
              THE COURT: Specifically what do you mean?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Counsel failed to interview
    witness Matthew Bryant before he testified at trial.
13
14
    Didn't even attempt to make any contact. And when he
15
    say counsel, she didn't give the okay to the investi-
16
    gator to contact him. I discussed this issue with Ms.
17
    Levy before.
18
              THE COURT: I have got it: Failure to contact
19
    the witness --
20
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
21
              THE COURT: -- Matthew, is it Bryant?
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Matthew Bryant.
           If I may, I would, would like to discuss some of
23
24
    the possibilities that it -- may have arisen had counsel
25
    contacted Mr. Bryant.
26
              THE COURT: I don't think you really have to
27
    do that. Just raise the point.
28
           The idea is recognize what your burden is. You
```

are not arguing your motion at this point; you are just trying to show me why you should be appointed an attorney to handle this issue separately. That's what you are trying to do.

THE DEFENDANT: Right. I got a better understanding. Thank you.

Raising another issue on Matthew Bryant's testimony is, counsel failed to object and request that the tape be edited to exclude the concocted admissions that Matthew Bryant stated or alleged to have come from the defendant.

I would also like to make a record, another issue pertaining to those alleged admissions that Matthew Bryant claimed the defendant made, that counsel failed to object to the prosecution using Matthew Bryant's taped statement, and the content of that statement which was outside of the Judge's limited instructions in closing arguments.

Moving on to another issue. Counsel failed to do a demonstrative investigation pertinent to the ability of the witnesses to clearly identify circumstances testified to by those witnesses when viewing through a partially tinted open window.

To be a little bit more specific about that issue, there was two issues that I asked counsel, and I know you said I shouldn't get into this, but I feel I need to.

One was when counsel did take pictures of the

12 -

car, I notified her that it appeared, because of the fact that the car had been released from evidence and sold to the public, that the tint on the windows had been changed, and I wanted her to check into that. She failed to do it.

I also asked her to have someone positioned in the car with my complexion and my height to give the jury an insight on the ability to identify someone. She failed to do that.

Also like to address another issue arising out of the release of the car from the property of the Oakland Police office, I mean department.

As counsel failed to file a motion to dismiss the car due to the fact that the possible evidence favoring the defendant was damaged when the car was released from O P.D.'s custody --

THE COURT: You don't mean "dismiss the car."

I think you probably mean to exclude evidence concerning the car?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Evidence was excluded. We couldn't review it, we didn't have the opportunity, so forth. And counsel failed to file the motion to dismiss the case due to the probable evidence that may have been favorable to the defense had we been able to research.

Counsel refused -- this is a new issue -- counsel refused to call or attempt to locate prosecution witness Terry Dandy.

```
1
              THE COURT: What's the person's name again?
 2
              THE DEFENDANT:
                               Terry Dandy.
              THE COURT: This was a prosecution witness --
 3
 4
              THE DEFENDANT:
                               Yes.
 5
              THE COURT: -- that the defense failed to
 6
    locate?
 7
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 8
              THE COURT: And somehow that's prejudice to
 9
    your case, that she didn't locate their witness who
10
    didn't testify here?
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes. If I may, I can go in to
12
    explain.
              THE COURT: About 30 seconds' worth.
13
14
              THE DEFENDANT: I believe it was pertinent to
    have Mr. Dandy testify in this case due to the fact that
15
16
    he alleged it was two shots fired out there on the
17
    scene, for one. One of those shots was unaccounted for
18
    on behalf of the defendant by the prosecution witnesses
19
    during the trial, which was a major contradiction.
20
           It was also a contradiction had Ms. Levy called
21
    Jamarrio Hennen.
22
           Terry Dandy was also present during an assault
23
    against the defendant in which Terry Dandy struck the
24
    defendant.
25
           This all occurred two days before the shooting,
26
    which contradicted all of the prosecution's accounts as
27
    far as these assaults occurring months before this
28
    alleged shooting occurred.
```

```
1
           Moving on -- oh, and also concerning Terry
 2
    Dandy's testimony, he drew a map, which I also have an
 3
    exhibit here, of when related to other issues that
 4
    counsel failed to do on my trial concerning ballistic
    testing, firing, and so forth. Please.
 5
           (Short discussion off the record)
 6
              THE DEFENDANT: I like to correct that.
 7
 8
    Counsel did do a ballistic test, but she failed to
 9
    convey to the expert the specifics of descriptions given
10
    by the prosecution witnesses of the gun. And there is
11
    an issue I would like to address outside the presence of
12
    Mr. Stallworth concerning that if we can come back to
13
    that.
1 4
              THE COURT: Set that one aside.
15
              THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Counsel refused to --
16
    this is a new issue -- counsel refused to question the
17
    integrity of homicide officer Sergeant Green and
18
    District Attorney representatives handling the
19
    Preliminary Hearing.
20
              THE COURT: Refused to investigate the
21
    integrity of Green?
22
              THE DEFENDANT: Investigate and integrity of
23
    Sergeant Green.
24
              THE COURT: And who else?
25
              THE DEFENDANT: And the district attorneys who
26
    handled the Preliminary Hearing.
27
              THE COURT: Do you know who that is offhand?
28
              THE DEFENDANT: Mean. Paul Mean.
```

MR. STALLWORTH: Jim Meehan. 1 2 THE COURT: Jim Meehan? THE DEFENDANT: Counsel failed -- this is 3 another issue -- counsel failed to raise the issues 4 5 concerning the contradiction between witnesses of the 6 description they gave and all statements which some were 7 inconsistent compared to others. But they all contradicted concerning the attire that the defendant is 8 9 alleged to have on that day. And that was a black 10 beanie, a black cap. And Shanae Anderson, which counsel 11 failed to raise, was in an afro. 12 Counsel refused -- another contradiction: 13 Counsel refused to establish the contradictions of 14 events described by witnesses Raymond Jones, Mary Washington and Mary Loggins that were in contrast of 15 Bianca Moore's and Shanae Anderson's versions of events 16 17 pertaining to the moment they were able to identify the 18 shooter. MS. LEVY: Your Honor, for the record it looks 19 20 like Mr. Kilgore is on No. 21. 21 THE COURT: That's fine. 22 THE DEFENDANT: Counsel failed to address the 23 issue pertaining to the extent of Raymond Jones' 24 involvement in relation to the stolen car report and the location in which the car was found. 25 Moving along, counsel failed to elect from the 26 27 testimony of defense investigator Monte Beers statements 28 that were made in previous interview with Mary

Washington concerning her version of someone running from the alleged crime scene and concealing something under their coat.

And in addressing the matter of law, which I'm not too clear on, I would like to say that counsel failed to object or file any type of motion of dismissal before the prosecution, using perjured testimony before the course of this trial.

THE COURT: What do you mean by "perjured testimony"?

THE DEFENDANT: In counsel's closing -- I mean the District Attorney's closing arguments, he stated to the jury that, okay, I will give you that Raymond Jones lied, he was aware of the fact that the gun was in the car at the time they drove over to the scene where the alleged crime occurred.

Now, I'm not for sure if that would be considered perjury, use of perjured testimony, knowing on behalf of the prosecution or not, so I said it's an issue of law that another attorney would have to address.

THE COURT: Since, Mr. Stallworth, there is no evidence that Mr. Stallworth was there --

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me?

THE COURT: Since there is no evidence that Mr. Stallworth was there at the time, I guess that may be his opinion that Mr. Jones gave false testimony about at least portions of it. And that happens, sadly, in a lot of cases.

```
1
              THE DEFENDANT: Counsel refused to investigate
    into all and any involvement by the F.B.I. in this case.
              THE COURT: And, again, to what end did that
 3
    prejudice your case?
 4
              THE DEFENDANT: It is my understanding from
 5
    having a conversation with Mr. Jones a month or so after
 6
 7
    this occurred, after he had been arrested, that he was
    being offered a reward that was offered to him by F.B.I.
 8
 9
    agents and et cetera.
           During the hearing, the voluntariness of Raymond
10
11
    Jones, counsel failed to inquire into the coercion of
12
    the second arrest and the interaction of the District
13
    Attorney in that matter.
14
              THE COURT: I'm not sure I got that one.
15
    During the voluntariness of the testimony --
16
              THE DEFENDANT: During the hearing.
17
              THE COURT: -- of Raymond Jones. Yes.
              THE DEFENDANT: Of the voluntariness --
18
19
              THE COURT: Right.
20
              THE DEFENDANT: -- of Raymond Jones, counsel
21
    failed to inquire into the coercion.
22
              THE COURT: Investigate the possibility that
23
    those statements were coerced.
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes. And the interaction of
24
25
    the District Attorney.
              THE COURT: And the action of whom?
26
27
              THE DEFENDANT: The interaction of the
28
    District Attorney with Mr. Jones relating to that
```

coercion. 1 THE COURT: Got it. 3 THE DEFENDANT: Counsel failed to establish some type of calendar dates of Bianca Moore's testimony 4 5 pertaining to the matters which she gave dates, and so 6 forth, concerning events that occurred between the 7 deceased and the defendant. I'd like to say it was to 8 show lack of credibility on Ms. Moore's behalf. 9 Counsel failed to impeach Ms. Moore concerning ' 10 the number of times that she claimed to have seen the 11 defendant prior to the shooting. 12 Counsel failed to inquire into issues concerning 13 Bianca Moore's testimony that I have stated or gave --14 given notes to counsel in relation to Ms. Moore's 15 testimony. 16 I don't know. That's kind of vaque. 17 THE COURT: You lost me there. 18 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I gave her notes to ask 19 her certain things, specifics pertaining to her 20 testimony. And counsel failed to --21 THE COURT: Follow-up on notes that you gave 22 Ms. Levy --23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 24 THE COURT: -- concerning potential 25 questioning of the witness Bianca Moore. 26 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Also I would like to add 27 with Raymond Jones and Shanae Anderson. I would say 28 every witness.

Okay. I think there's about one more issue I 1 would like to address before going or requesting an 2 in-camera hearing, is the fact that counsel failed to 3 4 request of the Court an instruction for murder in the second degree by means of drive-by shooting and 5 outlining the issues of intent, as the prosecution did 6 7 for murder in the first degree, by means of drive-by 8 shooting. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Does that summarize those 10 things that should be discussed publicly? THE DEFENDANT: I think that pretty much got 11 12 to most of them. Yeah. If there's anything else, would 13 I be able to call Mr. Stallworth back? THE COURT: Well, basically you know what this 14 hearing is about. The idea is for you to explain to me 15 why there may be a colorable claim to have counsel, 16 17 other than Ms. Levy, represent you at a motion for new 18 trial. And I have asked you to divide those into a 19 couple of categories. 20 And I know you have looked at this and I know you 21 have got a list in front of you. But in terms of the 22 things that you are conceding can be discussed publicly, 23 have we pretty much gone through those?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

24

25

26

27

28

THE COURT: The thing is, if I decide to release Mr. Stallworth, I don't want to send him back downstairs and bring him back up and send him back downstairs and bring him back up.